

### 1: Diplomat arrested in Germany enjoys full immunity: Iran

*Psychoquackery, Why It Enjoys Immunity: The Problems Met in Seeking to Control Mental Quackery and a Survey of Mental Hygiene [D. O. Cauldwell] on [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com) \*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. This scarce antiquarian book is a facsimile reprint of the original.*

Cauldwell was born in Cleveland, Ohio , the son of a surgeon. Cauldwell reports himself as from childhood having had a special interest in sexual anatomy. After several years as a private general practitioner , Cauldwell became an Associate Medical Officer of the Department of War , and as a contract surgeon for the Army , and became a neuro - psychiatrist for the Department of War. In , Cauldwell ended active practice to become a writer on topics of health, notably sexology. He denied that there were modes of thinking intrinsically linked to male or female biology. Primarily because of this view of gender as plastic, and secondarily because of the limitations of medical science, he regarded sex reassignment surgery as an unacceptable response to transsexualism, and instead advocated that it be treated as a mental disorder though he advocated acceptance of homosexuality and of transvestism. The Popular Sexology of David O. A History of Transsexuality in the United States. See also Various publications of Haldeman-Julius which contain a brief biographical sketch of Cauldwell. The Diary of a Sexologist: Works [The titles of the Haldeman-Julius publications were chosen by or at the insistence of Haldeman-Julius, to provoke sales. Test Tube Babies-Latest Facts. Effects of Castration on Men and Women. Accidental, Voluntary and Involuntary Castration. Psychological and Biological Paternity: Facts Concerning Stature of Mind and Body: A Study of Wet Dreams: What is the Pop-Fly Embrace? How Dangerous are Excesses? What is, or is Not, Ethical or Propitious? Sex Art and Blackmail. Critics Destroy the Beautiful. Cops and Judges Like Sexy Art. Miniature Semi-Nude Beauty in a Fishbowl.

### 2: ~Vice President does not enjoy immunity~™

*Psychoquackery, Why It Enjoys Immunity: The Problems Met in Seeking to Control Mental Quackery and a Survey of Mental Hygiene Average rating: 0 out of 5 stars, based on 0 reviews Write a review Literary Licensing, LLC.*

The Vice President is expected to go to the Supreme Court where he will raise immunity from legal suits as his pivotal defense. Should this happen, Binay will make history as the first vice president to be charged in court. Should this prosper, the Ombudsman will file charges against Binay with the Sandiganbayan, a setback to his campaign for the presidency. Mendoza, a foremost authority on the Constitution, said that Binay does not enjoy immunity, unlike the President, because of two reasons: Binay allegedly committed corrupt acts when he was mayor of Makati, his previous position, and not when he was vice president. Neither is he being prosecuted for acts as chair of the Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council, his cabinet post. No man is above the rule of law. But that cannot be said for the vice president. Fr Joaquin Bernas SJ, one of the framers of the Constitution, also categorically said that Binay is not covered by executive immunity. When pressed to discuss the issue further, Bernas declined, saying he was busy. We gathered from those who are in touch with him that he no longer grants media interviews. During the term of President Corazon Aquino, the Court said: He or she can be appointed to the cabinet. Like other cabinet officials, Binay is legally accountable for corruption and abuse of power. The Constitution has enshrined, after all, that public office is a public trust. In Latin America, two vice presidents are currently facing lawsuits for alleged corrupt activities. He continues to hold office. In Guatemala, the vice president recently resigned after the Supreme Court stripped her of immunity because she was reportedly involved in a Customs corruption racket. Two historical examples of US vice presidents in trouble with the law are often cited. Vice President Aaron Burr was indicted for murder in the s. He did not argue then that a sitting vice president was immune from criminal prosecution. Agnew eventually resigned and avoided trial.

## 3: Immunity from prosecution (international law) - Wikipedia

*Books by D. O. Cauldwell, Sex Fallacies, Superstitions And Facts, Sex Practices In Marriage, The Intimate Embrace, What Is A Hermaphrodite?, Psychoquackery, Why It Enjoys Immunity, How You Can Become A Practical Psychoanalyst, The Art Of Preserving One's Manhood.*

The government is not liable to suit unless it consents thereto, and its liability in suit cannot be extended beyond the plain language of the statute authorizing it. The courts have recognized it both as a principle that was inherited from English common law, and as a practical, logical inference that the government cannot be compelled by the courts because it is the power of the government that creates the courts in the first place. The Federal Tort Claims Act and the Tucker Act are not the broad waivers of sovereign immunity they might appear to be, as there are a number of statutory exceptions and judicially fashioned limiting doctrines applicable to both. In Federal tax refund cases filed by taxpayers as opposed to third parties [11] against the United States, various courts have indicated that Federal sovereign immunity is waived under subsection a 1 of 28 U. Supreme Court held that in case where an individual paid a federal tax under protest to remove a federal tax lien on her property where the tax she paid had been assessed against a third party, the waiver of sovereign immunity found in 28 U. The government may not be enjoined from infringing a patent, and persons performing work for the government are immune both from liability and from injunction. In *Advanced Software Design v. Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis* ,[14] the Federal Circuit expanded the interpretation of this protection to extend to private companies doing work not as contractors, but in which the government participates even indirectly. State sovereign immunity in federal courts[ edit ] Early history and Eleventh Amendment[ edit ] In , the Supreme Court held in *Chisholm v. In* , the Eleventh Amendment was ratified in response to this ruling, removing federal judicial jurisdiction from lawsuits "prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State". The validity and retroactivity of the Eleventh Amendment was affirmed in the case *Hollingsworth v. Later interpretation*[ edit ] In *Hans v. Louisiana* , the Supreme Court of the United States held that the Eleventh Amendment re-affirms that states possess sovereign immunity and are therefore immune from being sued in federal court without their consent. In later cases, the Supreme Court has strengthened state sovereign immunity considerably. *Native Village of Noatak* , the court explained that we have understood the Eleventh Amendment to stand not so much for what it says, but for the presupposition of our constitutional structure which it confirms: *Board of Regents of University System of Georgia*. Writing for the court in *Alden*, Justice Anthony Kennedy argued that in view of this, and given the limited nature of congressional power delegated by the original unamended Constitution, the court could not "conclude that the specific Article I powers delegated to Congress necessarily include, by virtue of the Necessary and Proper Clause or otherwise, the incidental authority to subject the States to private suits as a means of achieving objectives otherwise within the scope of the enumerated powers. *Chatham County* emphasizes added. Thus, cities and municipalities lack sovereign immunity, *Jinks v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency*. In *Department of Revenue v. Kuhnlein*, the Florida Department of Revenue claimed that sovereign immunity prevented plaintiffs from bringing a case that alleged that a tax violated the Commerce Clause and, furthermore, that if the tax was unconstitutional, the refund request could not be given because it did not comply with state statutes for tax refunds. The Florida Supreme Court rejected those arguments, stating: Moreover, neither the common law nor a state statute can supersede a provision of the federal or state constitutions. Tribal sovereignty in the United States The federal government recognizes tribal nations as "domestic dependent nations" and has established a number of laws attempting to clarify the relationship between the federal, state, and tribal governments. Generally speaking, Native American tribes enjoy immunity from suitâ€”in federal, state, or tribal courtsâ€”unless they consent to suit, or unless the federal government abrogates that immunity. Under certain circumstances, a tribal official acting in his or her official capacity, and within the scope of his or her statutory authority, may be cloaked with sovereign immunity. Foreign sovereign immunity in state and federal courts[ edit ] Main article: It also establishes specific procedures for service of process and attachment of property for proceedings against a

Foreign State. In international law, the prohibition against suing a foreign government is known as state immunity. Local governmental immunity[ edit ] Counties and municipalities are not entitled to sovereign immunity. In *Lincoln County v. By* contrast, a suit against a statewide agency is considered a suit against the state under the Eleventh Amendment. William Fletcher, a professor of legal studies at Yale University, explains the different treatment on the ground that in the nineteenth century, a municipal corporation was viewed as more closely analogous to a private corporation than to a state government. Exceptions and abrogation[ edit ] Discrimination[ edit ] If the state or local government entities receive federal funding for whatever purpose, they cannot claim sovereign immunity if they are sued in federal court for discrimination. Garrett seems to nullify this; however, numerous appellate court cases, such as *Doe v. Nebraska* in the 8th Circuit [20] and *Thomas v. University of Houston* of the 5th Circuit [21] have held that, as long as the state entity receives federal funding, then the sovereign immunity for discrimination cases is not abrogated, but voluntarily waived. Since the receiving of the federal funds was optional, then the waiver of sovereign immunity was optional. If a state entity wanted its sovereign immunity back, all they have to do in these circuits is stop receiving federal funding. However, the 2nd Circuit does not share this ideal. Instead, the federal court system provides a neutral forum for the case. Congress, if it so chooses, may grant lower federal courts concurrent jurisdiction over cases between states. However, Congress has not yet chosen to do so. Thus, the United States Supreme Court currently has original and exclusive jurisdiction over cases between state governments. Suits filed against state officials under the "stripping doctrine"[ edit ] The "stripping doctrine" permits a state official who used his or her position to act illegally to be sued in his or her individual capacity. When a claimant uses this exception, the state cannot be included in the suit; instead, the name of the individual defendant is listed. The claimant cannot seek damages from the state, because the claimant cannot list the state as a party. The claimant can seek prospective, or future, relief by asking the court to direct the future behavior of the official. *Pennhurst State School and Hospital v. The Young* doctrine was narrowed by the court in *Edelman v. Prospective relief* includes injunctions and other equitable orders, but would rarely include damages. This limitation of the Young doctrine "focused attention on the need to abrogate sovereign immunity, which led to the decision two years later in *Fitzpatrick*. Congressional power of enforcement The federal government and nearly every state have passed tort claims acts allowing them to be sued for the negligence , but not intentional wrongs[ citation needed ], of government employees. The common-law tort doctrine of respondeat superior makes employers generally responsible for the torts of their employees. In the absence of this waiver of sovereign immunity, injured parties would generally have been left without an effective remedy. *Seminole*, supra; *Fitzpatrick v. The court* requires "a clear legislative statement" of intent to abrogate sovereignty, *Blatchford*, supra; *Seminole*, supra. *Florida Board of Regents. College Savings Bank v. The Court* has found that somewhat different rules may apply to Congressional efforts to subject the states to suit in the domain of federal bankruptcy law. In *Central Virginia Community College v. Katz* , the Court held that state sovereign immunity was not implicated by the exercise of in rem jurisdiction by bankruptcy courts in voiding a preferential transfer to a state. The Court then crystallized the current rule: Katz added this caveat: Certain contracts with the government[ edit ] By way of the Tucker Act , certain claims of monetary damages against the United States are exempt from sovereign immunity. These cases are heard by the United States Court of Federal Claims , or, for cases involving less than ten thousand dollars, a district court has concurrent jurisdiction. Examples of contracts where immunity is waived include:

## 4: Sovereign immunity in the United States - Wikipedia

*Books Advanced Search Today's Deals New Releases Best Sellers The Globe & Mail Best Sellers New York Times Best Sellers Best Books of the Month Children's Books Textbooks Kindle Books Livres en français.*

Why did the owners of a derrick barge enjoy immunity from being sued in Hong Kong courts? Background to the Intraline case Intraline brought an action against Guangdong Salvage Bureau GSB - although the judgment refers to it as "GZS", presumably as an abbreviation for the Mandarin term "GuangZhou Salvage" , the owners of the ship or vessel "Hua Tian Long", for breach of contract arising from failure to make available the vessel, which is the largest floating derrick crane-barge based in Asia, to work on offshore Malaysian and Vietnamese projects for the installation of pipelines and oil platforms. Sovereign immunity Under the principles of sovereign immunity, no state can intervene in the affairs of another state by claiming jurisdiction over that state. By the end of the hearing the defence accepted that this concept did not apply to this case, since the PRC exercises sovereign power over Hong Kong after 1 July under the "one country, two systems" principle. There was therefore no question about its not being a foreign sovereign state. The judge noted that there were other cases to the opposite effect which he preferred, and which were considered to be a better fit for the concept of sovereign immunity premised upon mutual respect for the dignity of foreign sovereign states. Such immunity should therefore not be applied in any form within the same state. Crown immunity - did it apply at all? The primary issue to the case was therefore whether crown immunity applied, as represented by the maxim "the sovereign can do no wrong". Under this doctrine, the crown is not bound by statute unless expressly named or by necessary implication. Although before the handover in the Hong Kong statute enabled certain proceedings to be brought against the Government of Hong Kong, it had no effect on, and did not remove the concept of, the crown immunity of the Queen in the UK. The court held that after the handover in of Hong Kong to the PRC, the concept of crown immunity as imported from customary international law continues to exist, and PRC would also enjoy the privilege of crown immunity. Factors which appears to have persuaded the court in accepting that GSB was not a separate legal entity undertaking commercial activities independent from the PRC Government included: The court also said that the nature of the "crown immunity" precludes the development of an approach which accords immunity only to functional "acts of state" and therefore not to commercial acts. Accordingly the owner of the derrick barge was entitled to assert "crown immunity". Crown immunity - was it waived? Ultimately it was a pyrrhic victory for GSB as the court held that GSB waived its right to claim crown immunity through its conduct which included: What steps can you take to minimise your risks? While the facts of this case meant that "sovereign immunity" was not available to an entity of the PRC Government under Hong Kong law, it provides a useful reminder that, in other jurisdictions, the outcome may be very different. When contracting with a party which may be a sovereign counterpart, to minimise the risks of a sovereign entity successfully escaping liability by relying upon an immunity defence, you may wish to consider: In that regard, the judgment in the Intraline case stated that it had not been easy to sort out the precise organisational structure to determine whether GSB was a separate legal entity or part of the Ministry of the PRC. Evidence presented to the court included the way the entity was initially set up, its shareholding status, its rights in running the business, the way it is managed, and statements published by the relevant Ministry; including a comprehensive waiver of immunity clause in the contract. In that regard, one should also investigate whether the entity has the authority to do so; including in the contract the choice of law of a jurisdiction that would make it more difficult for a defence of jurisdictional immunity to be made out. In the Intraline case, the Hong Kong court held that crown immunity was available to the PRC entity, even though the transactions were commercial in nature. Related Knowledge Get in touch information is loading Disclaimer Clayton Utz communications are intended to provide commentary and general information. They should not be relied upon as legal advice. Formal legal advice should be sought in particular transactions or on matters of interest arising from this communication. Persons listed may not be admitted in all States and Territories. Related Expertise Related knowledge information is loading Site Information.

## 5: Results for D-O-Cauldwell | Book Depository

*Buy Psychoquackery, Why It Enjoys Immunity: The Problems Met in Seeking to Control Mental Quackery and a Survey of Mental Hygiene by D O Cauldwell (ISBN: ) from Amazon's Book Store.*

Print Article While it might seem like an obscure topic, the issue of sovereign immunity comes up with some regularity in intellectual property disputes. When it applies, its effect may be substantial. Sovereign Immunity is the legal principle where a sovereign entity is immune from being sued for various actions unless it has waived immunity by an express statement or action. The United States is a collection of overlapping sovereign entities. One entity is the Federal Government. Under the Eleventh Amendment, states are largely immune from being sued in a Federal court. The various American Tribal Nations are also recognized as sovereign entities and enjoy sovereign immunity similar to that of the states. Most patent, trademark, and copyright law is exclusively governed by Federal law. Because violations must be addressed in Federal court, when the infringer is a government, sovereign immunity becomes issue. Immunity extends beyond the central government body to all parts of the entity. Many are surprised to learn that a state university can assert sovereign immunity. State schools often engage in substantial commercial activities that raise potential IP issues. Sovereign immunity issues are also not confined to lawsuits in a Federal court but can also extend to various adversarial Federal administrative procedures. For example, an inter partes review IPR is a trial-like proceeding before an administrative court to challenge the validity of patents. If the patent is owned by a state university, immunity may block this type of challenge. Recently, some private companies have tried to leverage sovereign immunity by assigning patents to a Tribal Nation, licensing them back and then arguing that sovereign immunity barred an IPR challenge to the patents. Whether tactic will succeed is still unclear. So can the Federal or State government be sued for infringement under Federal patent, trademark, or copyright law? The answer often depends on the particular facts and specific legal issues of a dispute. That said, in most cases the answer is Yes for the U. Government and No for states and Tribal Nations, unless they have taken a specific action to waive immunity for that matter. A brief summary follows. If the question comes up you should consult with your IP attorney. This waiver means that patent and copyright infringement suits can be brought against the U. The waiver is not without some limits. First, the suit cannot be filed in a regular U. Instead, it must be brought in the Court of Federal Claims, a special court set up to handle suits against the U. There are no jury trials in the Court of Federal Claims. Also, if the infringement is by a government contractor for work being done for the U. Courts have concluded that this waiver language applies to direct infringement and to importing infringing products to the U. However, the issue of whether the waiver extends to claims of indirect patent infringement contributory or induced infringement and infringement by exporting unassembled parts of an invention for use elsewhere has not been resolved. Similar to patents and copyrights, the federal government specifically waived sovereign immunity for violations under the Lanham act, the Federal law that governs trademark rights 15 U. All Federal trademark laws can be applied to the government. Trademark lawsuits can be filed in any appropriate court and are not restricted to the Court of Federal Claims. In general, states “ including many arms of a state such as state universities “ are immune from being sued for violating Federal intellectual property laws unless they affirmatively have waived the immunity. This disparity can give the state a significant advantage over other entities in IP matters. A state can be sued for violating its own state law. There are usually some alternative state laws that can be applied in trademark and copyright matters infringement but these alternatives are often limited both in scope and the remedies available. There is often no state law that can be substituted for patent infringement. Federal infringement suits can sometimes be brought against individuals working for the state if they are sufficiently involved in the infringing act. However, the economics and limited remedies that can be obtained often do not make these suits worthwhile. The Federal Government has periodically tried to level the playing field by passing laws that expressly remove state sovereign immunity from IP suits. In and Congress passed the Copyright, Trademark, and Patent clarification acts that specifically eliminated state sovereign immunity from these relevant Federal laws. In , addressing a patent infringement suit brought against the State of Florida on a patent related to a college

savings program , the Supreme Court held the general waiver of State immunity from patent lawsuits unconstitutional. The reasoning striking the patent law has been extended to preserve states immunity from suits under Federal trademark and copyright laws as well. It is not unusual for a contract between a private company and a state university to include an immunity waiver clause for certain issues. Immunity can also be waived if the State voluntarily invokes Federal jurisdiction, such as by asserting its own IP against a 3rd party or voluntarily joining a Federal lawsuit. However, the scope of the waiver is viewed very narrowly. As a result, even if the state a has waived immunity for one issue in a lawsuit, such as by suing for patent infringement, it may still claim immunity from other claims that are not very closely related, such as counterclaims alleging infringement of different patents. State immunity may also extend to certain administrative proceedings if they are adversarial and run in a way that is similar to a regular lawsuit. Early last year the Patent Trial and Appeal Board PTAB , an administrative court, held in several different decisions that an Inter Partes Reviews IPR could not be brought to challenge patents owned by state universities because of sovereign immunity. In an order issued by an expanded board of seven judges up from the usual three , the Board confirmed that sovereign immunity applied to state universities in IPR proceedings but in this particular case, the university had waived immunity because it previously asserted the patent in Federal court against the same party who sought the IPR. It is too soon to say whether this result will be challenged on appeal. Absent a waiver, they too are immune from lawsuits asserting infringement of Federal patent, trademark, and copyright laws and subject to the same types of waiver considerations. In September, , the large pharmaceutical company Allergan took steps to employ tribal immunity to protect its patents on the drug Restasis. Allergan assigned its patents to the St. Immediately afterwards, the Tribe argued that an IPR challenging those patents could not proceed because of tribal immunity. The motion has not been decided. Many companies and organization have weighed in on the issue in this case. Some members of Congress have threatened to pass legislation specifically removing sovereign immunity for Tribal Nations for IP matters like this. Because the immunity of Tribal Nations is not enshrined in the U. Constitution, it is easier for laws removing their immunity to pass judicial review. Regis Mohawk Tribe argues that they should be treated no differently than state universities found to be immune from IPR challenges and there is no law to support a finding that immunity does not apply. They, along with other Indian Tribes, also argue that the transaction is not a sham but instead is part of a larger plan to diversify from conventional economic activities, such as casinos, by investing in patents, technology, and research. The tribe has stated that it plans to invest the licensing and royalty revenues earned into health, safety, education and cultural programs. However this issue is decided, this case is unlikely to be the end of the matter. A decision is likely to be appealed. Also, news reports indicate that the St. Regis tribe holds 40 patents it recently acquired from a technology company and that it is in the process of preparing to monetize them. The pages, articles and comments on IPWatchdog. Discuss this There are currently 2 Comments comments. Dan February 1, The case is currently on interlocutory appeal to the Fourth Circuit with oral argument scheduled in late March,

*Big Blue Books. This collection Why They Have an Enormous Influence on American Thought and Custom. Psychoquackery Why it Enjoys Immunity.*

The Maid of Orleans. Dictatorship Over the Intellect. Culture and Its Modern Aspects. A Book of Persons and Personalities: Confessions of a Debunker. A Road-Map to Literature: Good Books to Read. An Agnostic Looks at Life: Challenges of a Militant Pen. The Sign of the Four: A Sentimental Journey through France and Italy. A Study in Scarlet: A Sherlock Holmes Detective Story. What is Wrong with our Schools? Free Speech and Free Thought in America. A Book of Myths and Myth-Makers. Snapshots of Modern Life. Sane and Sensible Views of Life. A Report of the Rev. Debunking the Lourdes "Miracles" and Other Articles. Graft Corruption and Incompetence in Contemporary Democracy. The Amazing Frame up of Mooney and Billings: How Man Made God: What God Cost Man: The Philosophers Make God Respectable: The God of the Middle Ages: The God of the Deists and the Philosophers: Vice in German Monasteries: A Dramatic Poem in Five Acts. What Can a Free Man Believe? Famous Dates in History: A Chronological History of the World. Truth About the Catholic Church. The Beginning of Real Civilization: Fundamentals of a Dance Education. The Morals of the Savage: Morals in the Ancient World: The Childhood of the Human Race: The Awakening of Humanity: Man Gradually Lifts the Fogs of Obscurantism. True Tales of Buried Treasure. On the Trail of "Pretty Boy" Floyd: The Way of Men With Maids and other stories. Old Grubstake Days in Joplin: Stories about Indian Maidens: Exciting Adventures Along the Indian Frontier: Gamblers in Love and other stories. A Lesson in Love. The Last Government Land Lottery: Indian Dances, Medicine Men, and Prophets: Essays of an Erotologist: Bestiality and the Law: Bestiality in Ancient and Modern Times: How Comic Strips are Made: A Philosophy for World Unification: Scientific Humanism as an Ideology for Cultural Integration. Sex Ideas in Popular Songs: The Funny Side of Divorce: What is a Hermaphrodite? A Man of Learning: Sexual Slavery in America. Feminine Hygiene in Marriage. Test Tube Babies-Latest Facts. A Book of Popular Superstitions: The Lives and Loves of Ancient Courtesans. Effects of Castration on Men and Women: Is Sexual Sterilization Easy? Perverted Haters of Sex: The Menace of Mysticisms: Sex Crimes Among Juveniles: A Study of Various Delinquencies. On the Value of Scepticism. Can Men be Rational? Stoicism and Mental Health. What is the Soul? Catholic Girl and Atheist. How to get Ideas for Popular Stories. Shakespeare-The Greatest Genius of the World. Which Way to a Free World? The Crime of Superstition. The Trial of C. Easy Lessons in Practical Psychoanalysis. So You Married an Alcoholic? Adventures in the Realm of Ideas. The Whip and the Rose. The Life-Story of Robert G. Practical Psychiatry for Everyone. What Can a Sick Person Believe? The Foundations of Faith. How to Select a Gift. The Story of the French Revolution. Why Suckers Always Lose. Treatment of Impotence in Man and Woman. Sterility in Men and Woman. Schizophrenia and Mental Danger Signals. What Women Should Know about the Menopause: Prostate Gland Diseases and Their Treatment: When Are Girls Promiscuous? Why Sex Offenders Act that Way:

### 7: David Oliver Cauldwell : Wikis (The Full Wiki)

*Press TV - Iran's Foreign Ministry spokesman says an Iranian diplomat, who was arrested in Germany on the false charges of being linked to a bomb attack plot in the French capital, Paris, enjoys full diplomatic immunity. Bahram Qassem made the remarks on Sunday in reaction to earlier reports in.*

Functional immunity[ edit ] Functional immunity arises from customary international law and treaty law and confers immunities on those performing acts of state usually a foreign official. Any person who, in performing an act of state, commits a criminal offence is immune from prosecution. That is so even after the person ceases to perform acts of state. Thus, it is a type of immunity limited in the acts to which it attaches acts of state but ends only if the state itself ceases to exist. The immunity, though applied to the acts of individuals, is an attribute of a state, and it is based on the mutual respect of states for sovereign equality and state dignity. States thus have a significant interest in upholding the principle in international affairs: State offices usually recognised as automatically attracting the immunity are the head of state or the head of government , senior cabinet members, ambassadors and the foreign and defence ministers. For example, an English court held that a warrant could not be issued for the arrest of Robert Mugabe on charges of international crimes on the basis that he was serving as head of state at the time that the proceedings were brought. However, once the accused leave their offices, they are immediately liable to be prosecuted for crimes committed before or after their term in office or for crimes committed whilst in office in a personal capacity subject to jurisdictional requirements and local law. It may be the case that functional immunity is itself being eroded. Recent developments in international law suggest that *ratione materiae* may remain available as a defence to prosecution for local or domestic crimes or civil liability, but it is not a defence to an international crime. International crimes include crimes against humanity , war crimes , and genocide. The principle of depriving immunity for international crimes was developed further in the jurisprudence of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, particularly in the Karadzic, Milosevic, and Furundzija cases but care should be taken when considering ICTY jurisprudence due to its ad-hoc nature. This was also the agreed position as between the parties in their pleadings in the International Court of Justice Case Concerning the Arrest Warrant of 11 April Democratic Republic of the Congo v. In the Appeals Chamber of the Special Court for Sierra Leone held that indicted Liberian president Charles Taylor could not invoke his Head of State immunity to resist the charges against him, even though he was an incumbent Head of State at the time of his indictment. Nevertheless, this decision may signal a changing direction in international law on this issue. It is worth noting that the decisions of the Spanish and UK courts in relation to Pinochet were based directly on existing domestic law, which had been enacted to embody the obligations of the treaty. Although a state party to the treaty, Chile itself had not enacted such laws, which define the specified international crimes as crimes falling within the domestic criminal code and making them subject to universal jurisdiction, and thus Chile could only prosecute on the basis of its existing criminal code - murder, abduction, assault etc. The reasons commonly given for why this immunity is not available as a defence to international crimes is straight forward: Criminal acts of the type in question are committed by human actors, not states; and 2 we cannot allow the *jus cogens* nature of international crimes, i. However, the final judgment of the ICJ regarding immunity may have thrown the existence of such a rule limiting functional immunities into doubt. Regarding claims based on the idea that a senior state official committing International crimes can never be said to be acting officially, as Wouters notes: In November , French prosecutors refused to press charges against former US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld for torture and other alleged crimes committed during the course of the US invasion of Iraq, on the grounds that heads of state enjoyed official immunity under customary international law, and they further claimed that the immunity exists after the official has left office. Diplomatic immunity Personal immunity arises from customary international law and confers immunity on people holding a particular office from the civil, criminal, and administrative jurisdiction. It is extended to diplomatic agents and their families posted abroad and is also valid for their transfer to or from that post, only for the country to which they are posted. Under personal immunity, private residence, papers, correspondence, and property of an official enjoying

personal immunities are inviolable. According to Cassese , personal immunities are extended to cover personal activities of an official, including immunity from arrest and detention but the host state may declare the person persona non grata , immunity from criminal jurisdiction, immunity from the civil and administrative jurisdiction of the host state. No immunities hold for private immoveable property unless it is held on behalf of the sending state for the purposes of the mission, issues of succession, professional or commercial activity exercised outside of official functions, or the official has voluntarily submitted to the proceedings. Personal immunities cease with the cessation of the post. Cases of overlap[ edit ] When a person leaves office who is under a personal immunity and has committed a criminal act covered also by functional immunity, the personal immunity is removed, as usual. That is what happened in the Augusto Pinochet case before the House of Lords. Senator Pinochet was able to be extradited to face only charges not under functional immunity and meeting the separate tests for extradition, under English law.

### 8: Big Blue Books IU Lilly Library

*Psychoquackery, Why It Enjoys Immunity: The Problems Met in Seeking to Control Mental Quackery and a Survey of Mental Hygiene.* by D O Cauldwell. Starting at \$

### 9: IP and Sovereign Immunity: Why You Can't Always Sue for IP Infringement

*Psychoquackery, Why It Enjoys Immunity: The Problems Met in Seeking to Control Mental Quackery and a Survey of Mental Hygiene* D. O. Cauldwell. kr. kr.

*Rules of inference and logical machinery What You Pay Attention to Expands The church bizarre Conceptual analysis in phenomenology and ordinary language philosophy Amie L. Thomasson Grade 11 maths exam papers and memos Reflective theology Rethinking Childhood (The Rutgers Series in Childhood Studies) Reel 1677. Russell and Scott Counties Speak Japanese (New Self-Taught Method) Saint John of the Cross Traditional healing, new science or new colonialism? Cola wars continue 2010 Sap ariba training material Descriptive history of the steam engine. Desistance from and persistence in offending Magda Stouthamer-Loeber, Rolf Loeber, Rebecca Stallings, and Western Zen (Millennium Books (Writers Club)) Letters From Gods Country Faith in the Past Their eyes were watching god chapter 7 Topik advance grammar list mediafire filetype All roads to Rome The Italian Economy Discover the Southwest With Kids Review of the Pilotage Act 1987. The Man Who Was Taller Than God (Carl Wilcox Mysteries) Routledge history of literature in english britain and ireland The Industrial Revolution (1600-1901) Quick reference for emergency nursing Russian Foreign Policy Z/OS for E-Business Review of English skills for the PPST Sacred male bonding rituals The families Mc Claghry Original card games Learning japanese kanji practice book Ty Ballroom Dancing To witness these wrongs unspeakable: the metaphorical, the material and the violenced body 38 special MIROKU FIREARMS MANUFACTURING CO. The Royal and Ancient Golfers Handbook 1999 Talent identification and management*